DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 749 SO 013 348

TITLE Discrimination in Canada: A Survey of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Concerned with Discrimination.

INSTITUTION Canadian Human Rights Commission, Ottawa (Ontario). Research and Special Studies Branch.

PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Discrimination; *Attitude Measures; Civil Rights Legislation; Language Proficiency; *Majority Attitudes; National Surveys; Questionnaires; Racial Discrimination; Religious Discrimination; Sex Discrimination; *Social Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

To identify attitudes of the Canadian public toward discrimination, the Canadian Human Rights Commission surveyed a representative sample of 2,000 Canadians. This document describes the survey, presents highlights, and explains how the survey is being used. The specific purpose of the survey was to provide information on public opinion regarding discriminatory practices based on factors having nothing to do with the activity from which a person is excluded. Five categories of questions were presented to respondents--(1) knowledge, judgments, and attitudes relative to human rights agencies and legislation in Canada, (2) personal knowledge and experience of discriminatory practices, (3) changes in patterns of discrimination, (4) special programs or affirmative action for disadvantaged groups, and (5) the extent of tolerant attitudes. Findings from analysis of responses to questions in these categories indicated that 68% of respondents considered the commissions effective in removing discrimination. The most commonly mentioned grounds on which respondents believed people are discriminated against are race/color, female sex, handicap, disadvantageous social situation, official language, religion, age, and ethnic or national origin. Seven percent of respondents experienced discriminatory exclusion in the past 12 months. The conclusions are that findings from surveys can help agencies such as the Canadian Human Rights Commission anticipate public response to certain initiatives in human rights programs and that similar surveys should be repeated regularly in order to study the evolution of the attitudes of Canadians concerning discrimination. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED202749

DISCRIMINATION IN CANADA:

A Survey of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Concerned with Discrimination

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ed Scallon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Canadian Human Rights Commission,
Ottawa, Canada
September, 1979

SP 013 348

HIGHLIGHTS

1. Nearly three-quarters of respondents (73%) are aware of the existence of human rights commissions in Canada.

2. Nearly one-half of respondents (47%) had heard about the efforts of human rights commissions 1 or more times in the past 12 months.

3. Two thirds (68%) of those who had heard of commissions' efforts in the past 12 months find commissions effective in removing discrimination.

4. Nearly 9 out of 10 respondents (86%) are in favour of having laws in Canada aimed at removing discrimination.

5. Two-thirds of respondents (67%) believe that some people are excluded from certain social and economic activities because of discrimination.

6. The most commonly mentioned grounds (in descending order of frequency) on which respondents believe people are discriminated against are: race or colour, female sex, handicap, disadvantaged social situation, official language, religion, age, and ethnic or national origin.

7. Seven per cent of respondents experienced discriminatory exclusion in the past 12 months; 6%, 1 to 3 times; 1%, over 3 times.

8. The most frequently mentioned grounds (in descending order of frequency, here and in numbers 11 & 13) on which respondents experienced discriminatory exclusion were: disadvantaged social situation, age, female sex, official language, handicap, personal appearance, race or colour, ethnic or national origin.

9. Discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation was experienced by 0.6% of respondents.

10. About one-third of respondents (35%) reported they had not become more tolerant in the past 10 years.

11. The most commonly mentioned grounds on which respondents reported becoming more tolerant (in the past 10 years) were: race or colour, handicap, female sex, religion, official language, age, disadvantaged social situation, sexual orientation.

12. Four of 10 respondents (43%) reported they had not become less tolerant in the past 10 years.

13. The most commonly mentioned grounds on which respondents reported that they had become less tolerant, were: race or colour, disadvantaged social situation, political opinion, handicap, sexual orientation, official language, age, and female sex.

14. It may be noted that of the 8 grounds on which some respondents most frequently reported becoming more tolerant, 7 are the same grounds on which other (presumably) respondents most frequently reported becoming less tolerant.

15. A small majority of respondents (52%) are in favour of special programs, or affirmative action ("preferential treatment to those that have been discriminated against").

16 A large majority of respondents (80%) are willing to pay for special civic measures to assist handicapped persons. Two-thirds (68%) are willing to accord equal employment opportunity to homosexual persons. Nearly one-half of respondents (47%) are willing to discriminate in employment matters on grounds of political affiliation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Highlights.....i

Introduction.....1

Chapter I. Knowledge, Judgements and Attitudes Relative to Human Rights Agencies, Work and Laws in Canada.....2

Chapter II. Personal Knowledge and Experience of Discriminatory Practices.....6

Chapter III. Changes in Patterns of Discrimination within Society and within Individuals...10

Chapter IV. Special Programs of Affirmative Action for Disadvantaged Groups.....14

Chapter V. The Extent of Tolerant Attitudes.....15

Chapter VI. Conclusions.....18

Technical Appendix.....22

Introduction

The development of legislation designed to protect Canadians from discriminatory practices based on factors having nothing to do with the activity from which the person is excluded, is a relatively new phenomenon in Canada. Agencies and commissions, such as the Canadian Human Rights Commission, are charged with applying this legislation. This Commission, as part of its legislated mandate, decided to take the pulse of the Canadian population in relation to attitudew towards discriminatory practices. The mechanism chosen was a survey of a representative sample of the national population. This survey will probably be repeated regularly in order to study the evolution of the attitudes of Canadians concerning discrimination.

Budgetary limitations only allowed a small number of questions. These were attached to a more general questionnaire administered to a sample of 2,000 Canadians. This brochure presents the results of a general analysis of the replies. It looks at differences in the data among regions, major cities, citysize categories, sex, age, family income and education.

It is hoped that, in spite of the limitations of the survey, it will allow agencies and organizations working in the area of human rights to perceive the need and aspirations of their clientele, and to anticipate public response to certain initiatives in human rights work. In a dynamic and more long-term perspective, the results could orient efforts of public education towards those areas in which people's attitudes are the least well informed.

A Technical Appendix describes the methodology used in carrying out the survey.

Research and Special Studies Branch,
Canadian Human Rights Commission,
Ottawa, Canada,
September, 1979.

CHAPTER I. Knowledge, Judgements and Attitudes Relative to Human Rights Agencies, ~~Work~~ and Laws in Canada.

In Chapters I to V the questions used in the survey will be presented first, followed by the data gathered from the respondents.

Question 1.A: As far as you know, do we have human rights commissions in Canada?

- Nearly three-quarters of respondents (73%) are aware of the existence of human rights commissions in Canada.
- Awareness is least present in the Atlantic Region (63%) and most present in British Columbia (77%). The other regions are, Québec,69%; Ontario,76%; and Prairies,76%.
- Awareness is most present in Toronto (84%), followed by Vancouver, 76%, then Montréal, 75%.
- Awareness varies continously with community size: it is highest in communities of 500,000 or over population (79%) and lowest in rural and under-1,000 areas (61%).
- Awareness is slightly higher among men (74%) than among women (71%).
- Younger persons, aged 18 to 34, are more likely to know about human rights commissions (78%), than older persons, aged over 54, (63%).
- Awareness of human rights commissions is continously more present as family income rises from under $8,000 (61%) to over $24,000 (86%).
- Awareness is more present among the more highly-educated, those with post high school, (86%), than among those with less education, part high school, (61%).

Question 1.8: How many times in the past 12 months have you heard of anti-discrimination efforts of human rights commissions?

Unless otherwise noted, the data below relate to persons who have heard of the efforts of human rights commissions 3 or more times in the past 12 months. Data were also collected on those who had heard 1 to 3 times. The data below relate to all 2,000 respondents; not only to those who had heard about commissions.

- Nearly one-half (47%) of all respondents have heard about the efforts of human rights commission 1 or more times in the past 12 months.

- The highest percentage who have heard 3 or more times of commissions' efforts is in Québec (27%) and the lowest in the Atlantic Region (15%). In Ontario the percentage is 16%; the Canadian average is 20%. The other regions are, Prairies, 18% and B.C. 19%.

- The percentage with "frequent hearing" (3 or more times) is highest in Montréal (29%). Toronto is 25% and Vancouver 23%.

- Frequent hearing is most common in cities of 500,000 orover (26%), and least common in rural and under-1,000 areas (13%).

- Frequent hearing is more common among men (23%) than among women (17%).

- Frequent hearing is more common among persons aged up to 54 (22%) than among those aged over 54 (14%).

- Frequent hearing varies continously with family income. It is lowest among those earning under $8,000 (12%), and highest among those earning over $24,000 (32%).

- Expectedly, it also varies with edycation, it is 13% among those with part high school and 32% among those with post high school.

Question 2: In your opinion, how effective have our human rights commissions been in removing discrimination up to now?

- Of the total 2,000 respondents, nearly one-third (32%) find that commissions are effective (either "highly effective" or "moderately effective") in removing discrimination.

- The following percentages relate to those who had heard of the efforts of human rights commissions 1 or more times in the past 12 months.

- Two-thirds (of those who had heard of efforts of commissions 1 or more times in the past 12 months) (68%) find commissions effective.

- The finding of effective is highest in the Prairies (73%) and lowest in British Columbia (61%). The other regions are, Atlantic, 70%; Québec, 69%; and Ontario, 66%.

- The three metropolitan areas shown separately in the survey are all below the national average of 68%; Montréal, 61%; Toronto, 63%; and Vancouver, 60%.

- The finding of effective does not vary in any discernible pattern with community size. It is highest in cities of 30,000 to 99,999 (84%), and lowest in cities of 500,000 or over (61%).

- The finding of effective is lower among men (64%) than among women (71%).

- There is no discernible pattern among the age groups nor among the family income groups. The finding of effective is lowest among the family income group, over $24,000 (62%).

- It is higher among those with part high school (71%), than among those with post high school (62%).

Question 3: To what extent are you FOR or AGAINST having laws in Canada aimed at removing discrimination in employment and in the provision of goods, services, facilities and accommodation?

The data below relate to those among the total 2,000 respondents who were "strongly in favour," or "moderately in favour" of having laws aimed at removing discrimination.

- A very large majority are in favour of anti-discrimination laws (86%).
- The proportion in favour is highest in B.C. (90%) and lowest in the Atlantic Region (81%). Next highest is Ontario (87%), then the Prairies (86%), and Québec (84%).
- The percentage in favour is 86% in Montréal, 85% in Toronto and 91% in Vancouver.
- There is no discernible pattern in a consideration of community size groups, except that the percentage in favour is uniformly higher in cities (86% to 89%) than in rural and under-1,000 areas (83%).
- The percentage in favour is slightly higher among women (88%) than among men (85%).
- The percentage in favour is higher among those aged 18 to 34 (90%) than among those over 54 (80%).
- It is higher among those with family incomes over $24,000 (91%), than among family incomes under $8,000 (79%).
- The percentage in favour is higher among those with post high school (91%) than those with part high school (82%).

CHAPTER II. Personal Knowledge and Experience of Discrimatory Practices.

Question 4.A: In your opinion, are some people excluded from certain social and economic activities because of discrimination?

- Two-thirds (67%) of the total 2,000 respondents believe that some people experience discrimination.
- This percentage is highest in B.C. (75%) and lowest in the Atlantic Region (62%). In Québec it is 66% , in Ontario 65% and in the Prairies 69%.
- The percentage who believe that some people experience discrimination is 75% in Montréal, 63% in Toronto, and 74% in Vancouver.
- It varies continuously with community size, from 71% in cities of 500,000 or over, to 60% in rural and under-1,000 areas.
- The perception of discrimination in society is virtually the same for women (66%) and men (67%).
- It varies continuously with age from 74% among the 18 to 34, to 55% among those over 54.
- It varies continuously with family income, from 58% for the under $8,000 to 79% for the over $24,000.
- The perception of discrimination in society also varies continuously with education: it is 57% among part high school, and 80% among post high school.

Question 4.B: If respondents answered "yes" to Question 4.A, they were asked in Question 4.B., "Please specify up to 5 grounds."

The 1,333 respondents who answered yes to Question 4.A, gave a total of 3,697 grounds of discrimination, an average of 2.77 each.

Of these 3,697 mentioned grounds of discrimination on the basis of which respondents feel that some people are suffering discrimination:

- 28% relate to race or colour;
- 12% relate to female sex;
- 8% relate to handicap, including physical and mental handicap and addiction;
- 8% relate to disadvantaged social situation, that is to say, the total of low income, U.I.C. or welfare recipient, living in public housing, neighbourhood, lacking education, lacking job experience, other social situation or status;
- 7% relate to one of the official languages;
- 7% relate to religion;
- 7% relate to age;
- 6% relate to ethnic or national origin;
- 1.4% relate to sexual orientation.

The above grounds account for 85% of the 3,697 mentioned grounds. Thus we may say that these are the grounds that respondents believe form the basis for discrimination against most persons who experience this treatment.

Question 5.A: How many times in the past 12 months have you been excluded from social or economic activities on grounds which you feel were discriminatory?

- 93% of respondents report "not at all." Seven per cent report one or more times (6%, 1 to 3 times; 1% over 3 times). The data that follow relate to those who report having experienced discrimination ("exclusion") 1 or more times.

- Exclusion ranges from 5% in the Atlantic Region to 8% in B.C. and Québec. Ontario is 6% and the Prairies are 7%.

- The rate of exclusion is 10% in Montréal and Vancouver. It is 5% in Toronto.

- Exclusion does not vary continuously with community size. It is 8% in cities of 500,000 or over and 5% in rural and under-1,000 areas. However, it is also 8% in cities of 1,000 to 29,999.

- Exclusion is 6% for men and 8% for women.

- It varies considerably with age from 12% for those 18 to 34, to 2% for those over 54.

- The rate of exclusion is virtually identical across the range of family-income groups.

- It varies continuously with education, however, from 5% for the part high school, to 11% for the post high school.

Question 5.B: If respondents answered "yes" to Question 5.A, they were asked in Question 5.B, "On what grounds? Please specify up to 5 types."

Of the 2,000 respondents, 136 had experienced exclusion. These 136 persons mentioned 173 grounds of discrimination, or 1.27 per respondent who experienced exclusion.

What follows is the frequency with which various grounds occur among all 173 grounds of discrimination. It is not the frequency with which acts of discrimination occur. The latter is not available from the survey data.

- The most frequently mentioned ground is disadvantaged social situation: 17% of all 173 grounds. This comprises low income, U.I.C. or welfare recipient, living in public housing, lacking education, lacking job experience, or other social situation or status.

- Age is 13% of grounds of exclusion.

- Female sex is 12% of grounds ("of exclusion" understood).

- Official language is 9% of grounds.

- Physical and mental handicap is 6% of grounds.

- Personal appearance is 6% of grounds.

- Race/colour is 5% of grounds.

- Ethnic origin is 4% of grounds.

- Sexual orientation is 0.6% of grounds.

- The above mentioned grounds account for 72% of the total 173 grounds on which respondents experienced discrimination.

CHAPTER III Changes in Patterns of Discrimination within Society and within Individuals.

Question 6: In which areas of discrimination has society progressed the MOST in the past 10 years? Please specify up to 5 areas.

- 6% replied "none"; 16% did not know; 7% did not state. This amounts to nearly one-third of the total (29%).
- The 1,428 respondents who mentioned 1 or more grounds, mentioned a total of 3,167 grounds, an average of 2.22 each.
- The following data relate to the percentage of grounds mentioned, not to the percentage of respondents.
- 25% of grounds relate to race or colour.
- 23% of grounds relate to female sex.
- 11% of grounds relate to physical and mental handicap including addiction.
- 6% of grounds relate to religion.
- 5% of grounds relate to official language.
- 5% of grounds relate to disadvantaged social situation.
- 4% of grounds relate to age.
- 3% of grounds relate to sexual orientation.

Question 7: In which areas of discrimination has society NOT progressed (or even regressed) in the past 10 years? Please specify up to 5 areas.

- 27% did not know; 16% replied "none"; and 13% did not state. This amounts to over one-half of the total (56%).
- The 870 respondents who mentioned 1 or more grounds, mentioned a total of 1,468 grounds, an average of 1.69 each.
- The following data relate to the percentage of grounds mentioned, not to the percentage of respondents.
- 26% of grounds relate to race or colour.
- 11% of grounds relate to physical and mental handicap including addiction.
- 11% of grounds relate to official language.
- 11% of grounds relate to disadvantaged social situation.
- 10% of grounds relate to age.
- 5% of grounds relate to female sex.
- 4% of grounds relate to religion.

QUESTION 8: In which areas of discrimination have YOU, YOURSELF, become MORE TOLERANT in the past 10 years? Please specify up to 5 areas.

- 35 % replied "none"; 13% did not know; and 13% did not state. This amounts to close to two-thirds of respondents (61%).
- The 783 respondents who mentioned 1 or more grounds, mentioned a total of 1,469 grounds, an average of 1.88 each.
- The following data relate to the percentage of grounds mentioned, not to the percentage of respondents.
- 26% of grounds relate to race or colour.
- 14% relate to physical and mental handicap including addiction.
- 9% of grounds relate to female sex.
- 9% of grounds relate to religion.
- 6% of grounds relate to official language.
- 6% of grounds relate go age.
- 5% of grounds relate to disadvantaged social situation.
- 4% of grounds relate to sexual orientation.

QUESTION 9: In which areas of discrimination have you become LESS TOLERANT in the past 10 years? Please specify up to 5 areas.

- 43% replied "none"; 15% did not state; and 13% did not know. This amounts to close to three-quarters of the total (71%).
- The 602 respondents who mentioned 1 or more grounds, mentioned a total of 882 grounds, an average of 1.47 each.
- The following data relate to the percentage of grounds mentioned, not to the percentage of respondents.
- 16% of grounds relate to race or colour.
- 10% of grounds relate to disadvantaged social situation.
- 9% of grounds relate to political opinion.
- 9% of grounds relate to physical and mental handicap including addiction.
- 9% of grounds relate to sexual orientation.
- 9% of grounds relate to official language.
- 5% of grounds relate to age.
- 5% of grounds relate to female sex.

It is important to note that in several of the same areas of discrimination, some respondents feel that society and themselves are becoming more tolerant and some respondents feel that society and themselves are becoming less tolerant. Thus race or colour is the most frequently mentioned ground in the replies to question 6, 7, 8 and 9.

CHAPTER IV Special Programs or Affirmative Action for Disadvantaged Groups.

Question 10: In general are you for or against society giving preferential treatment today to those that have been discriminated against in the past.

- A small majority of the 2,000 respondents are in favour (either "strongly in favour" or "moderately in favour") (52%). Another 10% are indifferent or have no opinion. Thus, 38% are definitely against.

- Agreement is highest in Québec (70%) and lowest in Ontario (41%). The other regions are Atlantic, 61%; Prairies, 48%; and B.C., 43%.

- Agreement is 69% in Montréal, 35% in Toronto and 52% in Vancouver.

- There is no discernible pattern among community size groups. Agreement is 54% in cities of 500,000 or over and 52% in rural or under-1,000 areas. It is, however, 46% in cities of 100,000 to 499,999.

- In favour of special programs are 49% of men and 56% of women.

- Agreement is 50% among those aged 18 to 34, and 55% among those aged over 54.

- Agreement is 59% among family incomes below $8,000 and 45% among family incomes of $24,000 or over.

- Agreement is 57% among those with part high school, and 46% among those with post high school.

CHAPTER V. The Extent of Tolerant Attitudes.

Question 11: A young woman is interviewed for a position as a policy analyst with an important government department. A routine security check shows that she is a member of and a contributor to an extremist opposition party. She is denied the position because of this membership. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with this decision. Do you: Agree strongly; Agree somewhat; Disagree somewhat; Disagree strongly ; Indifferent, no opinion (the last response was not read to the respondent).

- Of the total 2,000 respondents, 47% agree (either "strongly" or "somewhat") and 44% disagree. Nine per cent are indifferent or have no opinion.

- Agreement ranges from 55% in the Prairies to 39% in Québec. The Atlantic Region is 44%; Ontario, 50%; and B.C., 49%.

- Agreement is 39% in Montréal, 47% in Toronto and 46% in Vancouver.

- There is no discernible pattern in community size groups. Agreement is 44% in cities of 500,000 or over; it is 50% in cities of 100,000 to 499,999; and 49% in rural and under-1,000 areas.

- Agreement is 45% among men and 48% among women.

- There is no discernible pattern among the age groups. Agreement is 45% among those aged 18 to 34, and 47% among those aged over 54.

- Agreement tends to rise with rising family incomes. Thus, it is 40% under $8,000, 44% $8,000 to $16,000, 53% $16,000 to $24,000, and 51% over $24,000.

- Agreement tends to rise with rising education. It is 44% for part high school, 50% for full high school, and 49% for post high school.

Question 12: Mr. John Smith, a self-acknowledged homosexual, has applied for a job as a national security agent with the R.C.M.P. His professional qualifications are better than those of other applicants. Mr. Smith is hired. Do you (followed by the same responses as in Question 11).

- Two-thirds of respondents (68%) agree with this decision; 25% disagree and 7% are indifferent or have no opinion.

- Agreement varies from 73% in B.C. to 60% in the Prairies. The Atlantic Region is 63%; Québec, 71% and Ontario, 69%.

- Agreement is 79% in Vancouver; 75% in Montréal; and 68% in Toronto.

- Agreement is 74% in cities of 500,000 or over and 61% in rural and under-1,000 areas. It is 66% or 67% in the other city-size categories.

- Agreement is 66% among men and 70% among women.

- Agreement varies continuously with age. It is 79% among those aged 18 to 34, and 55% among those aged over 54.

- It also varies continuously with family income. It is 60% among the under $8,000, and 75% among the over $24,000.

- Agreement varies continuously with education. It is 62% among those with part high school, and 74% among those with post high school.

Question 13: Your community is considering installing ramps at street intersections to accommodate people in wheelchairs. Since this operation will cost the community a lot of money, property taxes will have to be raised about $36. To what extent do you agree that it should be done. Do you (followed by the same responses as in Question 11).

- Of the total 2,000 respondents, 80% agree; 17% disagree; and 3% are indifferent or have no opinion.

- Agreement varies from 86% in B.C. to 68% in the Atlantic Region. Québec is 76%; Ontario, 82%; and the Prairies, 82%.

- Agreement is 84% in Vancouver, 80% in Montréal and 78% in Toronto.

- There is no discernible pattern in a consideration of city-size categories. It is 85% in cities of 1,000 to 29,999, and 77% in rural and under-1,000 areas. It is 82% in cities of 500,000 or over.

- Agreement is 79% among men and 82% among women.

- Agreement varies continuously with age. It is 86% among those aged 18 to 34, and 74% among those aged over 54.

- It varies continuously with family income. It is 75% among the under $8,000, and 87% among the over $24,000.

- Agreement varies continuously with education. It is 76% among the part high school and 86% among the post high school.

CHAPTER VI. Conclusions.

Chapter I: Knowledge, Judgements and Attitudes Relative to Human Rights Agencies, Work and Laws in Canada.

Knowledge about human rights commissions and support for their legislation is very extensive in Canada. This knowledge and support are more common in the major cities, probably because of better communications. They are more common among persons of higher socio-economic status (as measured by family income and education) perhaps because these have a greater access to the media of communication and are more in sympathy with the principles governing human rights legislation.

Judgements about the effectiveness of the work of human rights commissions run counter to the above. Thus, the percentage of respondents who find this work effective is lower within the three major metropolitan areas and in cities of 500,000 or over. It is also lower among persons of high socio-economic status. This suggests that residents of large cities and persons of high socio-economic status take a more critical approach to the work of human rights commissions, perhaps because their attitudes are generally more critical towards the operations of public agencies.

Perhaps the findings of Questions 1 to 3, by region, could be suggestive to provincial human rights commissions in planning their programs of public information and education.

Chapter II: Personal Knowledge and Experience of Discriminatory Practices.

The awareness of discriminatory practices is much more common among younger persons and persons of high socio-economic status (Question 4.A). This is partially paralleled by the more frequent personal experience of discrimination by younger persons and persons with higher education (Question 5.A)

The most common grounds which respondents believe form the basis of discrimination by members of society are race or colour, female sex, handicap, disadvantaged social situation, official language, religion, age and ethnic or national origin.

Seven per cent of respondents experienced discriminatory practices directed against themselves. This percentage was higher in Montréal, Vancouver, and in the category of cities of 500,000 or over. It was significantly higher among younger persons.

and persons with post high school education. Perhaps the city-size phenomenon is due to a greater opportunity to report discriminatory behaviour in these areas; and the higher-education data may be due to a more sensitive attitude to perceived discrimination by persons with higher education.

It may be inferred from the data that, where education is relatively high, the experience of discrimination is more common, even when family income is low. This suggests that perceived discrimination does not so much occur more among persons of higher social class, but rather that education makes a person aware of his or her rights and of his or her dignity.

The most frequent grounds on which discrimination occurs are disadvantaged social situation, age (this relates to the high level of perceived discrimination among the young), female sex, personal appearance, race or colour and ethnic origin. Perhaps this finding could suggest areas of focus for public education and special programs by human rights commissions.

Chapter III: Changes in Patterns of Discrimination within Society and within Individuals.

The 7 grounds of discrimination concerning which respondents believe that society has progressed the most in the past ten years, are the same grounds concerning which respondents believe that society has not progressed or even regressed in the same period. This suggests a polarization within society; so that a certain segment is improving and another is not in the same areas of discrimination. It seems to show that even in areas in which society is making progress concerning discrimination, human rights agencies should continue their efforts of public education and information.

Of the 8 grounds of discrimination concerning which respondents report that they themselves have become more tolerant in the past ten years, 7 are the same grounds concerning which respondents report that they have become less tolerant in the same period. The extra gound in Question 8 is religion. And the extra ground in Question 9 is political opinion; this relates to the relatively high proportion who are prepared to discriminate on grounds of political opinion in Question 11.

Again, this similarity of grounds of discrimination on which both tolerance and intolerance have increased, suggests a polarization within society, with certain individuals

becoming more tolerant and others becoming less tolerant mainly in relation to the same areas of discrimination. It is important to note, however, that only 39% of respondents explicitly reported becoming more tolerant (Question 8), and only 29% explicitly reported becoming less tolerant (Question 9).

It is worth noting that sexual orientation is one of the 8 grounds on which respondents report themselves becoming in some cases more tolerant and in other cases less tolerant.

It seems significant that race or colour was the most frequently mentioned ground in Questions 6, 7, 8 and 9. This shows the importance of this ground within the question of discrimination and the work of human rights commissions.

The data in Questions 6 to 9 suggest that there has been progress in the elimination of discrimination but that efforts of enforcement and education must be continued even in those areas in which there appears to have been most progress.

Chapter IV: Special Programs or Affirmative Action for Disadvantaged Groups.

There is considerable resistance to affirmative action or "preferential treatment today to those that have been discriminated against in the past." This resistance is most pronounced among persons of relatively high socio-economic status. While these form the category, in Question 3, who are most in favour of having anti-discrimination legislation, they are relatively more resistant to preferential treatment for disadvantaged groups. Perhaps this is in keeping with a more critical attitude towards most government operations. On the other hand, these persons are also the category who could be most threatened by the changes brought about by affirmative action programs.

Replies to this question should be read in relation to Question 13, in which a definite program of preferential treatment for the handicapped is widely supported by persons of high socio-economic status. Thus, perhaps, preferential treatment is not supported in general, by these persons, but is supported in relation to special categories of individuals.

Chapter V: The Extent of Tolerant Attitudes.

These three situational questions, numbers 11 to 13, show that discriminatory attitudes are quite prevalent where political opinion is concerned, but that tolerant attitudes are very widespread where sexual orientation and special programs for the handicapped are concerned.

The discriminatory attitudes in the case of political opinion are more prevalent with higher socio-economic status, perhaps because these individuals have most to lose from a perceived threat of extreme political change.

On the other hand the tolerant attitude in refusing to discriminate on grounds of sexual orientation in employment matters is more prevalent among persons of higher socio-economic status. These tolerant attitudes towards minority sexual orientation are also more prevalent in cities of 500,000 or over. Perhaps this indicates an absence of moralistic attitudes within these categories of persons.

An overwhelming and very encouraging majority (80%) are in favour of special civic measures to assist the handicapped even where these would involve an increase in municipal taxes. Approval for this measure also rises with increasing socio-economic status, perhaps indicating that these persons can more afford to be compassionate in this instance.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

INTRODUCTION

Complan Research Associates Ltd., of Toronto and Ottawa, conducted the second of its quarterly national omnibus studies - ISSUES CANADA - from April 14 - 21, 1979. The Research and Special Studies Branch of the Canadian Human Rights Commission purchased a 10-minute segment of the questionnaire.

THE QUESTIONS

Officers of the Canadian Human Rights Commission submitted a draft survey instrument with questions on attitudes towards people including the acceptance of others. Complan's research staff edited this version, pre-tested it and made changes as a result. The Commission translated the survey instrument into French.

SAMPLING

The "universe" included adults, 18 years and over, living in private households, in urban and rural areas of the Canadian provinces. Those living in remote northern areas and on Indian Reserves were excluded as were those who could not speak either official language.

The sample of 2,000 respondents[1] was stratified proportionately by region and by community size according to the 1976 distribution of the population. This included 200 'clusters' of 10 respondents each. The 1976 Census of Canada was used as the sample 'frame'. Hence the sample quotas were set as follows:

[1] Target Sample, that is the number of completed interviews.

Distribution of the Sample according to the Distribution of the 1976 Population by Community Size[1]

Region	No. Cases	COMMUNITY SIZE				
	TOTAL	500,000+	100,000-499,999	30,000-99,999	1,000-29,999	-1,000 (Rural)
Atlantic	200	-	30	20	60	90
Québec	540	292	10	49	81	108
Ontario	720	273	158	58	101	130
Prairies	320	90	61	19	51	99
B.C.	220	90	20	20	40	50
TOTAL	2,000	745	279	166	333	477

[1] 1976 Census of Canada, Population: Geographic Distributions, Urban and Rural Distribution.

Selection Process

At each stage of the sampling process, the selection of units was made by random means. Hence, the reliability of the estimates can be calculated at different levels of sampling tolerance.

All steps up to the selection of blocks (in urban areas) and Enumeration Areas (in the rural areas) involved systematic sampling from Statistics Canada lists of Census Divisions and Census sub-divisions. Further, a combined total of 116 different urban and rural communities across the country were included in the sample, thus assuring a good geographical spread.

Selection of Households

On each chosen block, clusters of a fixed size (10) were selected. From a random start, and following a pre-determined route, interviewers took every 3rd household. In each chosen Enumeration Area in rural areas, the procedure was the same as above, except in farm areas, where every 2nd household was included from a random start.

Selection of Individuals

The Troldahl-Carter rotating grid was used to ensure a representative sample of persons 18 years of over. No substitutions were allowed.

RELIABILITY OF THE FINDINGS

As in all sample surveys, the findings are estimates only and are subject to normal sampling error. It should be noted that the sampling error is not the same for all estimates.

To minimize sampling errors caused by non-response, up to 3 calls at each chosen household were made, i.e., an initial call and up to 2 callbacks. Further, all initial calls were made at various times of the day or evening to attempt completion. By doing this, a 54% completion rate was achieved. Anticipating normal sample losses, allowance was made for ineligible households and for non-contact (including refusals) of eligible households and/or individuals.

FIELDWORK

Detailed instructions were written, in both official languages, on how to select the sample households and the eligible respondents and how to administer the questionnaire. All materials were distributed to Complan supervisors and interviewers in the selected communities.

On completion of the fieldwork, 15% of each interviewer's completed interviews was verified by supervisory personnel. The bulk of the interviews were conducted between April 14-21, 1979.

CODING AND TABULATION

All questionnaires were returned to Complan's Head Office in Toronto for coding and tabulation. Questionnaires were checked for completeness and adherence to all skip patterns. They were then coded according to a specially prepared coding manual.

Questionnaires were then keypunched (with 100% verification) on to IBM punch cards which were machine edited and later converted to magnetic tape.